

**COMPLAINANT INFORMATION**

First Name: Diana Last Name: Williams  
Address: 131 Calvin Hill Ct. City: Balto. State: Md. Zip Code: 21222  
Phone Number: 410-828-2013  
Email: lady-d@verizon.net

Preferred Title and Pronoun:

- Ms.
- Mr.
- Judge
- Dr.
- She/Her
- He/Him
- They/Them
- Other

If you are currently incarcerated, please check the box below and provide your Inmate Number:

- Inmate ID Number NA

**JUDGE INFORMATION**

First Name: Robert Last Name: Cohill

Court:

- Supreme Court of Maryland
- Appellate Court of Maryland
- Circuit Court
- District Court
- Orphans' Court

County/City: Balto. County

**CASE INFORMATION**

If your complaint is related to a court proceeding, please provide the information requested below. If not, please write NONE and proceed to the next section.

Case Name: State of Maryland vs Diana R. Williams  
Case Number (include all letters and numbers): C-03-CR-20-002995

Case Type:

- Civil
- Criminal
- Family/Domestic
- Juvenile
- Probate
- Traffic
- Protective/Peace Order
- Sexual Harassment
- Other

Date(s) of Hearing(s) or Other Proceeding(s):

Waiting on repeated motions for a hearing on my motions

Case Status:

- Pending
- Concluded
- Appealed

Relationship to the case:

- Plaintiff/Petitioner/Appellant
- Defendant/Respondent/Appellee
- Attorney for
- Witness for
- Relative/Friend of
- Other

**ATTORNEY INFORMATION**

If you were represented by an attorney, please provide the information requested below. If not, please proceed to the next section.

Name: NA I'm being represented by the law firm

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

**WITNESS INFORMATION**

Please provide the names and contact information for any witnesses to the judge's alleged sanctionable conduct, impairment, and/or disability. You may attach additional pages under "Supporting Materials" as necessary.

Name: NA

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

Phone Number: \_\_\_\_\_

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

STATEMENT OF FACTS

Please provide a detailed summary of your complaint. Please include specific facts, names, dates, locations, and other information that support your allegations that the judge engaged in sanctionable conduct and/or suffers from an impairment and/or disability. You may attach additional pages under "Supporting Materials" as necessary.

See "Attachment" for the additional material facts and evidence.

SUPPORTING MATERIALS

Please submit copies of any relevant printed materials that support your complaint. Submitted materials will not be returned to you. Do not submit original documents or any flash drives, CDs, DVDs, or other physical devices used to store data. You do not need to submit copies of transcripts or recordings of court proceedings as the Commission will access such information independently, if necessary.

See evidence that are part of the Attachments and the evidence from the copies of the Exhibits from my website, [www.dianarwilliams.com](http://www.dianarwilliams.com) that are requested to be submitted as evidence,

I solemnly affirm under the penalties of perjury that the contents of the foregoing document are true to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Signature: \_\_\_\_\_



Date: \_\_\_\_\_

1-20-25

I understand that:

- The Commission on Judicial Disabilities does not have authority to change, modify, or reverse a judge's decision in a case;
- The Commission on Judicial Disabilities does not have the authority to remove a judge from a case; and
- Filing this complaint is not an appeal or a substitute for an appeal.

**FAILURE TO SIGN THIS FORM MAY RESULT IN DISMISSAL OF YOUR COMPLAINT.**

**Printed forms can be mailed to:**

Commission on Judicial Disabilities  
P.O. Box 340  
Linthicum Heights, Maryland 21090

**Electronic forms can be submitted at:**

[www.courtscmd.org](http://www.courtscmd.org)

**Complaints cannot be submitted by telephone, fax, or email.**

To: 45<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump, Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney General of the DOJ, the newly appointed Director of the FBI, and the State of Maryland Commission on Judicial Disabilities ("Commission")

From: Ms. Diana R. Williams, Whistleblower, whose Criminal Case Number is C-03-CR-20-002995

Re: 1.) Plea that our 45<sup>th</sup> - 47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump, will have our Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney General of the DOJ, or the newly appointed Director of the FBI conduct its own investigation into the allegations cited in my Official Complaint to the Commission mailed on 12-16-24 ("12-16-24 Official Complaint") and, again, in this instant **"ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATEMENT OF FACTS"** forms to the Commission, which are additional material facts and evidence to further to substantiate the same allegations proclaimed in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint against Judge Cahill, namely, the allegations of breaching my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, my 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311, especially since there are allegations of Officers of the Court violating the federal crimes Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, ("Crimes against Humanity"), and/or attempting to and/or conspiring to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091. 2.) Plea that you, Hon. President Trump, will have our Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney General of the DOJ, or the newly appointed Director of the FBI to be in charge of overseeing the Commission to ensure the granting of my plea to the Commission to immediately assign another Investigative Counsel to

preside over my 12-16-24 Official Complaint, that is, an Investigative Counsel who does not work under the Commission to preside over a thorough investigation of the material facts and evidence, especially since it is being alleged by me that the Commission and the Director/Investigative Counsel, Tanya Bernstein ("Tanya Bernstein") are violating my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of impinging upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., & 455(a) in failing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as the presiding Officers of the Court because there is an appearance that the Commission and Tanya Bernstein would be biased and/or impartial due to Tanya Bernstein being employed by the Commission and the Commission being appointed by the Governor, and/or being appointed by one of the two former Governors of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan or Martin O'Malley, all of whom, along with former Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals of Maryland ("former Chief Judge Barbera"), the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, namely, the Mayor and City Council Members, the Judges, and/or other governmental are being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 – Genocide, ("Crimes against Humanity"), and/or the attempt to and/or the conspiracy to invade upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C & 1091 committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal activities.

Date: 1-20-25

As stated in Rule 18-421, the Commission shall refer all complaints and other written allegations of disability, impairment, or misconduct against a judge to an Investigative Counsel. Allegations must provide proof of misconduct in order to be deemed "Sanctionable Conduct". Moreover, if the Investigative Counsel concludes that the allegations presented, even if proved, would fail to constitute a

cognizable basis for a complaint, as defined in Rule 18-402(h), then the Investigative Counsel shall notify the complainant and the Commission, in writing, that the allegations presented were considered and found not to constitute a meritorious complaint that should be pursued and the reasons for that conclusion. Further, Section (b) of this Rule does allow the Investigative Counsel to communicate with the complainant or make an inquiry under section (f) of this Rule in order to clarify general or ambiguous allegations that may suggest a disability, impairment, or sanctionable conduct. After permitting the complainant to give additional evidence to substantiate her allegations, then the Investigative Counsel may conclude under this section that the allegations presented were considered and found not to constitute a meritorious complaint that should be pursued and the reasons for his/her conclusion.

According to Rule 18-402(h) "Sanctionable conduct" includes a judge demonstrating misconduct, persistently failing to perform the duties of the judge's office, or conduct prejudicial to the proper administration of justice. Still too, "Sanctionable conduct" can mean that a judge has breached any of the provisions of the Maryland Code of Judicial Conduct promulgated by Title 18, Chapter 100.

As stated in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint (Exhibits 195 on my website), because of my financial hardship at this time, I'm unable to afford the cost of printing copies of all of my numerous and lengthy Motions, Official Complaints, and other material evidence on my website, *www.dianarw.com* that need to be submitted into the record of the Commission as evidence to further substantiate the

allegations in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint, namely, that my 14th Amendment Right, my 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311 have been redundantly and/or intentionally violated by Judge Cahill. My loved ones help to maintain the cost of my website. Thus, it is my request that, since I give the Exhibit Number on my website to each of my signed and dated

Motions, my Official Complaints, and other documents, copies are made of my, which have the Findings and Orders of all of the presiding Judges, with the only exception being Judge Glass' Orders, written on the first page of my Motions. Still too, I'm pleading that all of these documents be submitted as more evidence into the record of the Commission.

Below are the additional material facts as supported by the evidence and, as permitted under Rule 2-241, that substantiate the allegations as asserted in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint, namely, that my 14th Amendment Right, my 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311 have been redundantly and/or intentionally violated by Judge Cahill.

**STATEMENT OF ADDITIONAL FACTS AND EVIDENCE TO SUBSTANTIATE**

**ALLEGATIONS CITED ABOVE**

Attached as Exhibit 1 is my letter mailed on 1-2-25 to the Administrative Clerk of Baltimore County Circuit Court along with 2 accompanying Exhibits (Exhibit 198 on my website), which responds to the

Administrative Clerk's requests in her memo dated 12-23-24 (Exhibit 197 on my website), which

basically seeks for validation of my criminal case's name and case number. As verified by the two Exhibits, which are copies of Judge Glass' 6-12-24 and 8-26-24 Orders relevant to expungement of my record, my criminal case is entitled State of Maryland vs Diana R. Williams and my Case Number is 03-CR-20-002995.

Germane to my case's status being found on the Circuit Court's website, when I viewed the Circuit

Court's website to make a copy of the my case's status on 7-11-24, I recognized that the Circuit Court for Baltimore County no longer docketed my Motions and Exhibits. I made a copy of the status of my case from the "File Date: 06/12/2024" to the "File Date of 07/11/24 (Exhibit 207 on my website). When I viewed the Circuit's Court's website on 7-26-24, I made a copy of the status of my case from the "06/14/2024" to the "File Date: 07/11/24" (Exhibit 207' on my website). As evidence by the copies of a section of the status of my case, each of my attached 2 Exhibits was posted on 7-11-24 on the Court's website as a "Supporting Exhibit". Also, as evidenced by these copies of a section of the status of my case, my Motions mailed on 6-28-24 (as evidenced by the "Certificate of Service included in my motions, which include my signature and the date) were docketed on 7-10-24.

When I called the Court to inquire about not being able to respond in a timely fashion to the

presiding Judges' Findings and Orders because I was no longer able to view the status of my case on the Circuit Court's website, Ms. Kira, one of the supervisory clerks, amongst other things, told me that she would docket my Motions and that I could call the clerk's office any time to inquire about the status of my case. My Motions docketed on 7-10-24 have yet to be assigned a presiding Judge by the two the Administrative Judges-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over criminal cases,

namely, Judge Robinson and Judge Cahill.

According to the Commission's organizational structure, Tanya Bernstein is employed as the

Director/Investigative Counsel for the Commission. The Commission is appointed by the Governor, which includes either being appointed by Wes Moore and/or by one of the two former Governors of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan, and Martin O'Malley, who, along with former Chief Judge Barbera, the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, namely, the Mayor and City Council Members, Judges, and 194' on my website), in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint (Exhibit 195 on my website), in my present appeal in the in Banc Review in my civil litigation in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City, and/or in other Motions to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, ("Crimes against Humanity"), and/or the attempted to invade upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091, committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal activities due to knowingly and willingly: a.) allowing our children to be exposed to lead-contaminated drinking water and/or lead-based paint hazards for almost three decades by the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City (the Mayor and Baltimore City Council) from at least 1993 to the present, namely, Kurt Schmoke, Martin O'Malley, Sheila Dixon, Stephanie Rawlings, Catherine Pugh, Jack Young, and the present Mayor, Brandon Schott, against all of the present members of the City Council of Baltimore City (hereinafter "City Council"), and against those who were members of the City Council since at least 1993. b.) having ignored for years the alleged heinous crimes against the Mayor of Baltimore City, owners of the public



schools, namely, that of repetitiously and/or intentionally exposing our children to lead poisoning for decades and, thereby, violating Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempting to and/or conspiring to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 (“Crimes against humanity”), committing misconduct in office, and/or refusing to prosecute for over a quarter of a century the owners of the schools, the Officers of the Court, and/or other governmental officials, who are being alleged to have repeatedly and/or deliberately infringed upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 (“Crimes against humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or other criminal acts and, in some instances, for over 25 years. d.) and/or having accepted bribes and/or other criminal acts and, in some instances, for over 25 years. e.) and/or having accepted bribes and/or compensation to let the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, the Officers of the Court, and/or other government officials walk free who have been alleged to have breached Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, and/or attempted to and/or conspired to violate Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 (“Crimes against humanity”), committed misconduct in office, and/or other crimes.

Since allegations are made in my Motions and in other documents that the evidence will support that Officers of the Court have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, (“Crimes against Humanity”), and/or the attempted to and/or the conspired to and/or the conspired to infringe upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091, have invaded upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), have breached my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, my 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and/or my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, it is my plea that our 45<sup>th</sup> - 47<sup>th</sup> Hon. President Trump, will have our Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney General of the DOJ, or the newly appointed Director of the FBI conduct its own independent investigation in regard to my 12-16-24 and my 12-26-24 Official Complaints to the Commission (Exhibits 195 and 196, respectively, on my website). Moreover, I’m alleging that Tanya Bernstein and the Commission are violating my 14<sup>th</sup> due to impinging upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. 7 455(a) due to failing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as presiding Officers of the Court since there is an appearance that Tanya Bernstein and the Commission would be biased and/or impartial as a result of Tanya Bernstein being hired as the Director/Investigative Counsel for the Commission, and the Commission being appointed by the Governor, which could include either being appointed by Wes Moore or by one of the two former Governors of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan, and Martin O’Malley, all of whom, along with former Chief Judge Barbera, are being alleged in my 2 separate Motions mailed on 12-16-24, other Motions, and/or in 12-16-24 Official Complaint to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, (“Crimes against Humanity”), and/or attempted to and/or the conspired to breach Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091. Thus, it is, too, my plea that, you, Hon. President Trump, whose Inauguration Ceremony as our official Hon. 47<sup>th</sup> President of the U.S. is scheduled for today, namely, 1-20-25, the same day I mailed my **“ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATEMENT OF FACTS”** to the Commission, will have our Hon. Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney General of the DOJ, or the newly appointed Director of the FBI to launch its own investigation into my 2 separate Official Complaints to the Commission, namely, my 12-16-24 Official Complaint and my 12-26-24 Official Complaint, and to have supervision in overseeing the Commission to ensure the granting of my plea by the Commission to immediately assign another Investigative Counsel who does not work under the Commission to preside over a thorough investigation of the material facts and evidence, especially since it is being alleged by me that the Commission and the Director/Investigative Counsel, Tanya Bernstein,

are violating my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 as a result of impinging upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C., § 455(a) in failing to voluntarily disqualify and recuse themselves as the presiding Officers of the Court because there is an appearance that the Commission and Tanya Bernstein would be biased and/or impartial due to Tanya Bernstein being employed by the Commission and the Commission being appointed by the Governor, which means either being appointed by the Wes Moore and/or being appointed by one of the two former Governors of Maryland, namely, Larry Hogan or Martin O'Malley, all of whom, along with former Chief Judge Barbera of the Court of Appeals of Maryland ("former Chief Judge Barbera"), the owners of the public schools in Baltimore City, namely, the Mayor and City Council Members, the Judges, and/or other governmental are being alleged to have violated Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 – Genocide, ("Crimes against Humanity"), and/or the attempt to and/or the conspiracy to invade upon Federal U.S. Code, 18 U.S.C. & 1091 committed misconduct in office, and/or have committed other criminal activities.

In terms of past Findings and Conclusion by Tanya Bernstein, as evidenced by her 2018 letter (Exhibit 199 on my website) which has her Findings and Conclusion that respond to my 2018 Official Complaint (Exhibit 200 on my website), Tanya Bernstein was the presiding Investigative Counsel who investigated my 2018 Official Complaint against Judge Fletcher-Hill and Judge Karen, who are two of the former presiding Judges in my present civil litigation, which is currently on appeal in the In Banc Review in the Circuit Court for Baltimore City and whose initial Civil Complaint was filed in 2017.

As evidenced by the lack of facts and supporting evidence declared in Tanya Bernstein's 1-3-25 Findings and Conclusion (Exhibit 208 on my website), which respond to the material facts and legal arguments in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint to the Commission (Exhibit 195 on my website), I'm alleging that the evidence substantiate the allegations that, like in her 2018 Findings and Conclusion, Tanya Bernstein has failed to disclose, consider, and resolve a single material fact and/or legal argument proclaimed in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint that substantiate the allegations in my Official Complaint, namely, that the evidence support the assertion that my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, my 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311 have been redundantly and/or intentionally violated by Judge Cahill. Still too, as evidenced by the facts cited in both of her 2018 and 1-3-25 Findings and Orders and the material facts and legal arguments asserted in my 2018 and in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint to the Commission from which Tanya Bernstein responds to, other declaring the Rule 18.421, Tanya Bernstein fails to provide a shred of material facts and/or evidence that would disprove the material facts and legal arguments alleged in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint.

In Tanya Bernstein's Findings dated 12-27-24, she states that "Pursuant to Maryland Rule 18-421 (b), the allegations have been considered and found not to constitute a meritorious complaint that should be pursued because they are factually unfounded or even if proved, fail to establish "Sanctionable conduct", impairment, or disability. Please provide an accurate case name, and case number. If you have additional information in support of the allegations, please submit it in writing within the next 30 days either by mail to the address above or by email to [commJD@mdcourts.gov](mailto:commJD@mdcourts.gov)." Also, in her memo, Tanya Bernstein asserts that "The Maryland Commission on Judicial Disabilities ("Commission") has received your correspondence containing allegations against Judge Dennis Robinson of the Circuit Court

I believe that Tanya Bernstein has damaged her credibility due to being misleading in stating the facts, which could insinuate that only Judge Robinson is being in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint to have redundantly and/or intentionally infringed upon my 14th Amendment Right, my 2nd Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311. Also, as evidenced by the lack thereof of facts as supported by the evidence in Tanya Bernstein's 1-3-25 Findings and Conclusions and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint, the evidence substantiate the allegations that Tanya Bernstein fails to disclose, consider, and resolve in her Findings and Conclusion any of the material facts and legal arguments stated in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint which substantiate these allegations. Therefore, I'm requesting that the Commission assigns another Investigative Counsel to preside over the instant "ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATEMENT OF FACTS" forms to the Commission and over my 12-16-24 Complaint (Exhibit 195), which are additional material facts and evidence to further substantiate the allegations stated above and in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint against Judge Cahill. Further, I'm pleading that the Commission assigns an outside, independent Investigative Counsel to preside over this instant "ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATE OF FACTS" forms to the Commission of additional material facts and supporting evidence to further substantiate the allegations in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint to the Commission. I will be sending a copy of my 12-16-24 Complaint (Exhibit 195 on

Morever, as evidenced in her 2018 and 1-3-25 Findings and Conclusions, it appears that Tanya Bernstein, simply quoted, almost verbatim, the same reasons for her conclusion in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint as she declared in her 2018 Conclusion for denying my 2018 Official Complaint, namely, that the allegations in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint did not constitute a meritorious complaint. However, as evidenced by her 1-3-25 Findings and Conclusion and as evidenced by the material facts and legal arguments in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint to the Commission, Tanya Bernstein failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in her Findings any of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint which substantiate the allegations that my 14th Amendment Right, my 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311 have been repetitiously and/or deliberately violated by Judge Cahill. Just as significant, Tanya Bernstein states as a fact in her 12-27-24 Findings that the allegations cited in my 12-16-24 Official Complaint was against Judge Robinson, although the evidence in the "Re" section" of my 12-16-24 Attachment to the STATEMENT OF FACTS" forms to the Commission clearly proclaim that I'm alleging that my 14th Amendment Right, my 2nd Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311 have been repetitiously and/or deliberately violated by Judge Robinson, Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and Judge S. Bailey.

for Baltimore County". However, as evidenced by the Attachment to my 12-16-24 Official Complaint entitled "Attachment as "Material facts", in my Complaint, I assert that my 14th Amendment Right, my 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311 have been repetitiously and/or deliberately violated by Judge Robinson, Judge Cahill, Judge Glass, Judge Alexander, and by Judge S. Bailey.

my website) and a copy of this instant **"ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATE OF FACTS"** to further substantiate the allegations in my 12-16-24 Complaint to our Hon. President Trump, whom I pray will have the Military Tribunal, the newly appointed Attorney of the DOJ, or the newly appointed Director of the FBI to launch its own independent investigation. Moreover, it is my plea that the Commission: **1.)** mandates that the new, independent investigator substantiates his/her reasons for his/her Findings and Conclusion with, in addition to citing the Rule, the material facts being supported by the evidence. **2.)** orders the a new, independent investigator to have copies of my Motions which have the presiding Judges' Findings and Orders cited on the first page of my Motions, my Official Complaints, and other documents, which I've given Exhibit numbers on my website and to include these documents as part of the evidence in the record of the Commission.

The evidence supporting the material facts below will further substantiate the allegations that Tanya Bernstein and Judge Cahill have used the same pattern of deceit in attempting to conceal the allegations that my 14th Amendment Right, my 2nd Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and/or Maryland Rule 2-311 have been redundantly and/or deliberately violated by Tanya Bernstein and Judge Cahill using the pattern of deceit, which includes: **1.)** misstating, suppressing, and/or misrepresenting in their Findings the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Findings of other Officers of the Court. **2.)** misstating, suppressing, and/or misrepresenting in their Findings the material facts and legal arguments and/or as declared in the Motions and as being represented Pro Se. **3.)** concealing in their Findings the material facts and legal arguments of other my Official Complaints and/or as declared in the Findings of other Officers of the Court. **4.)** concealing in her Findings the material facts and legal arguments cited in Official Complaints and/or as declared in the Motions and as being represented Pro Se that are contrary to her Findings and failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in her Findings these differences as substantiated by the evidence in the record. **5.)** failing to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments as stated in the Findings of other Officers of the Court. **6.)** failing to disclose, consider, and resolve all of the material facts and legal arguments as proclaimed in my Official Complaints and/or as declared in the Motions and as being represented Pro Se. **7.)** concealing in their Findings that the evidence in the record support the allegations that Officers of the Court exhibited judicial misconduct and obstructed justice by, amongst other things, committing the prejudicial error of perjury. **8.)** and/or concealing in their Findings that the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Findings of other Officers of the Court, as asserted in my Official Complaints, and/or as declared in my Motions.

These are the **"ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FACTS AS SUPPORTED BY THE EVIDENCE"** as cited in these instant **"ATTACHMENTS TO THE STATEMENT OF FACTS"**, (Exhibit 195' on my website) and as declared in my 2 separate Motions mailed on 10-21-24 (Exhibits 190" and 190"', respectively, on my website), Judge Cahill responded to my 2 separate Motions mailed on 10-1-24 (190 and 190', respectively, on my website). The additional supporting facts to substantiate that Judge Cahill breached repetitiously and/or deliberately my 14th Amendment Right, my 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 28 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311

include: 1.) As evidenced by his Findings and Orders docketed 10-11-24, Judge Cahill presided over my Motions mailed on 10-1-24 and simply has stamped on the 1<sup>st</sup> page of one of my Motions mailed on 10-1-24 (Exhibits 190 and 190', respectively, on my website) that "ALL REQUESTS FOR RELIEF CONSIDERED AND RESPECTFULLY DENIED", has stamped on my other Motions mailed on 10-1-24 the word, "DENIED", and has his signature on the first page of each of my Motions mailed on 10-1-24. 2.) In response to the Judge Cahill's Findings Orders docketed on 10-11-24, which respond to my Motions mailed on 10-1-24, I mailed my 2 separate Motions on 10-21-24. The heading in one of my Motions mailed on 10-21-24 (Exhibits 190' and 190" on my website) is entitled "MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OVER CRIMINAL CASES TO ASSIGN ANOTHER JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION RELATIVE TO JUDGE R. CAHILL'S ORDER DOCKETED ON 10-11-24 BECAUSE IN THE INSTANT MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION JUDGE R. CAHILL IS BEING ALLEGED TO HAVE VIOLATED THE DEFENDANT'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2<sup>ND</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 AND MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE ORDER THE PRESIDING JUDGE TO HAVE A MOTION ON THE HEARING AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311". As evidence by the material facts declared in this set of Motions, amongst other material facts, I assert that "...The evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in his Order docketed on 10-11-24, which responds to the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 10-1-24, substantiate the allegations that Judge R. Cahill breached the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 by failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his Order: a.) if the evidence substantiate the allegations that the previous presiding Judge, Judge Alexander, infringed upon the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 by failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in her 9-25-24 Findings and Order, which respond to the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions, which respond to Judge Glass' Order docketed on 8-27-24, the allegation that the other presiding Judge, Judge S. Bailey, violated the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 by infringing upon her own 5-21-20 Probation/Supervision Order (Exhibit 1 to the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions) in refusing to grant the Defendant her right to repossess her firearm and 15 bullets, although the Defendant had successfully been in compliance all of the conditions cited in Judge S. Bailey's 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21 and since the presiding Judge, Judge Alexander, failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in her Findings and Order docketed on 9-25-24, which respond to the Defendant's Motions docketed on 9-4-24, which respond to Judge Glass's Order docketed on 8-27-24, the allegations that Judge S. Bailey, the other former presiding Judge, violated the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 in her Findings and Order docketed on 6-25-24, which respond to the Defendant's Motions docketed on 6-1-24 as a result of infringing upon her own 5-21-20 Probation/Supervision Order (Exhibit 1 to the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions) in refusing to grant the Defendant her right to repossess her firearm and 15 bullets, although the Defendant had successfully been in compliance all of the conditions cited in Judge S. Bailey's 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21

successfully been in compliance all of the conditions cited in Judge S. Bailey's 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21.

Moreover, the evidence of the fact stated in and/or the lack thereof of fact cited in Judge R. Cahill's Order and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions, from which Judge R. Cahill's Order respond to, substantiate the material facts that Judge R. Cahill fails to disclose, consider, and resolve any of the material facts in the Defendant's Motions to substantiate the Defendant's allegations that her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were infringed upon by the presiding Judges, namely, Judge Alexander and Judge S. Bailey. In her Finding and Order docketed on 9-25-24, which respond to the Defendant's Motion docketed on 9-4-24, Judge Alexander fails to disclose, consider, and resolve if the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were infringed upon by Judge S. Bailey, the previous presiding Judge, who is being alleged in the Defendant's Motions to have breached the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to breaching her own Order cited in her 4-page 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order, which is Exhibit 1 in the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions.

Still too, the evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in Judge R. Cahill's Order docketed on 10-11-24 and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 10-1-24, from which Judge R. Cahill responds to in his Order, substantiate the Defendant's allegations that her 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 were infringed upon by Judge R. Cahill because he failed to, also, disclose, consider, and resolve in his Order whether the allegations in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 10-1-24, namely, that Judge S. Bailey, the other former presiding Judge, breached Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to breaching her own Order cited in her 4-page 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order, which is Exhibit 1 in the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions, especially Judge Alexander failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in her Findings and Order docketed on 9-25-24, if the material facts and legal arguments cited in the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions substantiate that Judge S. Bailey did violate the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 due to breaching her own Order cited in her 4-page 5-20-21 Probation/Supervision Order.

Further, the evidence of the material fact that Judge R. Cahill fails to disclose in his Order docketed on 10-11-24 one material fact and/or legal arguments in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 10-1-24 and from which he respond in his Order, substantiate the material fact that, without a single explanation for doing so, Judge R. Cahill refused to grant the Defendant her right to have a hearing on her Motion mailed on 10-1-24 as pleaded in the Motion and as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311." .... 3.) The heading in my other Motions mailed on 10-21-24 (Exhibit 190"" on my website) is entitled "3<sup>rd</sup> MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OVER CRIMINAL CASES TO ASSIGN, NOT JUDGE R. CAHILL, BUT ASSIGN JUDGE GLASS TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S INSTANT MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION TO STAY THE EXECUTION OF EXPUNGEMENT IN JUDGE GLASS' ORDERS DOCKETED

ON 8-27-24 AND TO CONTINUE THE STAY ON THE EXPUNGEMENT OF JUDGE GLASS' ORDER DOCKETED ON JUNE 12, 2024 UNTIL THIS CASE IS RESOLVED IN ITS ENTIRETY AND MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTION AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311". As evidenced by the facts asserted in these Motions, amongst other material facts, I state that..." For the 3<sup>rd</sup> time, the Defendant is

motioning the Judge-In-Charge over assigning a Judge to preside over the Defendant's criminal case to assign, not Judge R. Cahill, but assign Judge M. Glass to preside over the Defendant's instant Motion for Reconsideration to Stay the execution of expungement in Judge Glass' Orders docketed on 8-27-24 and to continue the Stay on the expungement of Judge Glass' Order entered in this case on June 12, 2024 until this case is resolved in its entirety because: a.) Judge Glass is the Judge who initially

presided over the Defendant's Expungement hearing June 9, 2024, is the Judge who ordered 30-day Stay on the granting of the Defendant's Expungement because Judge Glass informed the Defendant that her criminal case would no longer exist without the Stay on the Expungement. b.) Judge Glass is the presiding Judge whose 8-27-24 Order the Defendant responded to in her 9-4-24 Motions, in which one of her Motions pleads for the Judge-In-Charge Over Criminal Case to assign Judge M. Glass, to

preside over the Defendant's Motion to Stay the execution of expungement in Judge Glass' Orders docketed on 8-27-24 and to continue the Stay on the expungement of Judge Glass' Order entered in this case on June 12, 2024 until this case is resolved in its entirety. c.) There is appearance that the presiding Judge, Judge R. Cahill, would be impartial and/or biased due to the fact that the Defendant is alleging in her other Motions mailed on this same day, namely, 10-21-24, that Judge R. Cahill have

breached the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C., Section 242 by ignoring the Rule of Law and, thus, failing to disclose, consider, and resolve in his Order docketed on 10-11-24, which responds to the Defendant's Motions mailed on 10-1-24 Motions, any material facts and/or legal argument in the Defendant's 7-page Motion and which substantiate the allegations that the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 were violated by the previous presiding Judges,

namely, Judge Alexander and by Judge S. Bailey; also, Judge R. Cahill failed to allow the Defendant her right to a hearing on her Motions as permitted under Maryland 2-311. d.) The evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in Judge Cahill Order docketed on 10-11-24 and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 10-1-24, from which Judge R. Cahill responds to in his Order, substantiate that Judge R. Cahill violated the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 by ignoring the Rule of Law in failing to disclose, consider, and resolve, in his Order,

whether Judge S. Bailey breached the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 by refusing to grant the Defendant her right to repossess her firearm and 15 bullets, although the Defendant had successfully completed all of the conditions cited in Judge S. Bailey's 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21,

especially in view of the material facts that the presiding Judge, Judge Alexander, failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in her Findings and Order docketed on 9-25-24, which respond to the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions, if Judge S. Bailey breached the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C. Section 242 s by infringing upon her own 5-21-20 Probation/Supervision Order by refusing to grant the Defendant her right to repossess

her firearm and 15 bullets because the Defendant had successfully completed all of the conditions

cited in Judge S. Bailey's 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21. 2.) For the 1<sup>st</sup> time, the Defendant is pleading that the Judge-in-Charge of presiding over assigning Judges to preside over the Defendant's Motions order that the presiding Judge grant the Defendant her right to have a hearing on the instant Motion as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 and as pleaded in the Defendant's Motion".... 4.) As evidenced by the Orders docketed 11-13-24, Judge Cahill presided over my Motions mailed on 10-21-24 by simply having stamped the word, "DENIED" and his signature on the first page of my 2 separate Motions. Further, Judge Cahill failed to grant my right to have a hearing on the Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311 and as motioned in my 2 separate Motions mailed on 10-21-24. 5.) I allege in my Motions mailed on 10-21-24 that the evidence of the facts declared in and/or the lack thereof of facts stated in Judge Cahill's Order docketed on 11-3-24 and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in my 2 separate Motions mailed on 10-21-24 (Exhibits 190 and 190', respectively, from which Judge Cahill responds to in his Order, substantiate that Judge Cahill has violated my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, my 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 due to failing to adhere to Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) which mandates that he voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge and his Orders be deemed void and of no effect as a matter of law, namely, Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) because there is an appearance that Judge Cahill would be biased and/or impartial in being the presiding Judge over my Motions since Judge Cahill is being alleged in both of these Motions to have infringed upon my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, my 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 in violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18. 102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311. 6.) On 19-19-24, the Georgia Appellate Court recognized that there was an appearance of an Officer of the Court, the State Prosecutor for Georgia, Fani Willis, being biased and/or impartial and, removed the Fulton County District Attorney, Fani Willis from the Georgia election interference case against 45<sup>th</sup> – 47<sup>th</sup> Hon. Donald Trump and others. The Georgia Appellate Court cited an "appearance of impropriety" and declared that "this is the rare case in which disqualification is mandated and no other remedy will suffice to restore public confidence in the integrity of these proceedings." 7.) The U.S Supreme Court has already established that, if the allegations substantiate a violation of Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a), then the Judge has committed "Fraud upon the Court", and, thus, the Orders of Judge are deemed void and of no effect. 8.) Due to the evidence supporting the allegations of their infringing upon Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Judge Cahill has thereby, have committed "Fraud on the Court", have acted in his/her individual capacity and not in his/her judicial capacity, and has violated his/her oath of. 9.) Judge Cahill's Orders docketed on 11-13-23 and 11-15-24 and stamped on my Motions (Exhibits 190", 190"', 191, and 191', respectively, on my website) are deemed void and of no effect because Judge Cahill was were disqualified as a presiding Judge as decreed under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a) since there is an appearance that Judge Cahill would be impartial and/or biased as a result of being the presiding Judge over my Motions mailed on 10-21-24 since Judge Cahill is being alleged in both of these Motions to have infringed upon my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, my 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and my Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 in violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18. 102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311. 10.) Under Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), since there is an appearance that Judge Cahill would be impartial and/or biased due to being in charge of presiding over my 10-21-24 Motions in which he is being alleged to have infringed upon my 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, my 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and my Civil



Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 in violating Federal Statute 28 U.S.C & 455(a), Maryland Rule 18.102.11, and Maryland Rule 2-311, Judge should have voluntarily disqualified and recused himself as the presiding Judge. 11.) In response to the Judge Cahill's 2 sets of Findings Orders docketed on 11-13-24, I mailed 2 separate Motions on 11-18-24. The heading in one of my Motions mailed on 11-18-24 (Exhibit 191 on my website) is entitled "MOTION TO HAVE JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR. TO ASSIGN ANOTHER JUDGE TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION RELATIVE TO JUDGE R. CAHILL'S ORDERS DOCKETED ON 11-13-24 BECAUSE THE DEFENDANT IS ALLEGING IN THIS INSTANT MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND IN HER OTHER MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION THAT JUDGE R. CAHILL IS BEING ASSERTED TO HAVE VIOLATED FEDERAL STATUTE 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) AND MARYLAND RULE 18.101.11 AND, THUS, HAVE BREACHED THE DEFENDANT'S 14<sup>TH</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT, HER 2<sup>ND</sup> AMENDMENT RIGHT, AND HER CIVIL RIGHT UNDER TITLE 18, U.S.C., SECTION 242 AND MOTION TO HAVE JUDGE D. ROBINSON, JR. ORDER THE PRESIDING JUDGE TO HAVE A MOTION ON THE HEARING AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311". As evidence by the material facts declared in this set of Motions mailed on 11-18-24, amongst other material facts, I proclaim that "...1. For the 1<sup>st</sup> time, the evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in Judge Cahill Order docketed on 11-13-24 and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 10-21-24, from which Judge R. Cahill responds to in his Order, substantiate that Judge R. Cahill has violated the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 due to failing to adhere to Federal Statute 28 U.S.C. & 455(a) which mandates that he voluntarily disqualify and recuse himself as the presiding Judge because there is an appearance that Judge R. Cahill would be biased and/or impartial in presiding over the Defendant's instant Motions or presiding over her other Motions mailed on this day since Judge R. Cahill is being alleged in both Motions to have infringed upon the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242. 2.) Although the Defendant makes the pleading in her Motions, for the 1<sup>st</sup> time, Judge Cahill has invaded the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 by refusing to determine, if the previous presiding Judges, namely, Judge Alexander and Judge S. Bailey, trespassed the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 substantiating the allegations that both of these former presiding Judges breached the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 by refusing to grant the Defendant her right to repossess her firearm and 15 bullets, although the Defendant had successfully been in compliance all of the conditions cited in Judge S. Bailey's 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21 (Exhibit 1 to the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions) and although not one of these Judges provided tangible evidence to support denying the Defendant's firearm and 15 ammunition, nor would either of these Judges grant the Defendant her right to have a hearing on the Motions as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311. 3.) For the first time, the evidence of the facts cited in and/or the lack thereof of facts cited in Judge Cahill Order docketed on 11-13-24 and the evidence of the material facts and legal arguments asserted in the Defendant's Motions mailed on 10-21-24, from which Judge R. Cahill responds to in his Order, substantiate that Judge R. Cahill transgressed the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 by ignoring the Rule of Law in failing to disclose, consider, and

resolve, in his Order, whether Judge S. Bailey breached the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 by refusing to grant the Defendant her right to repossess her firearm and 15 bullets since the Defendant had successfully completed all of the conditions cited in Judge S. Bailey's 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21, and especially since Judge Alexander failed to disclose, consider, and resolve in her Findings and Order docketed on 9-25-24 if Judge S. Bailey breached the Defendant's 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment Right, her 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment Right, and her Civil Right under Title 18, U.S.C Section 242 by impinging upon her own 5-21-20 Probation/Supervision Order (Exhibit 1 to the Defendant's 9-4-24 Motions) by refusing to grant the Defendant her right to repossess her firearm and 15 bullets because the Defendant had successfully completed all of the conditions cited in Judge S. Bailey's 4-page Probation/Supervision Order entered on 5-20-21. 4.) For the 1<sup>st</sup> time, the Defendant is pleading that Judge D. Robinson, Jr. orders that the Defendant have a hearing on the instant Motion as permitted under Maryland Rule 2-311".... 12.) The heading in my other Motions mailed on 11-21-24 (Exhibit 191 on my website) is entitled "3<sup>rd</sup> MOTION TO HAVE THE JUDGE-IN-CHARGE OVER CRIMINAL CASES TO ASSIGN, NOT JUDGE R. CAHILL, BUT ASSIGN JUDGE GLASS TO PRESIDE OVER THE DEFENDANT'S INSTANT MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION TO STAY THE EXECUTION OF EXPUNGEMENT IN JUDGE GLASS' ORDERS DOCKETED ON 8-27-24 AND TO CONTINUE THE STAY ON THE EXPUNGEMENT OF JUDGE GLASS' ORDER DOCKETED ON JUNE 12, 2024 UNTIL THIS CASE IS RESOLVED IN ITS ENTIRETY AND MOTION FOR A HEARING ON THE MOTION AS PERMITTED UNDER MARYLAND RULE 2-311". As evidenced by the facts asserted in these Motions, amongst other material facts, I state that.... "For the 3<sup>rd</sup> time, the Defendant is motioning the Judge-in-Charge over assigning a judge to preside over the Defendant's criminal case to assign, not Judge R. Cahill, but assign Judge M. Glass to preside over the Defendant's instant Motion for Reconsideration to Stay the execution of expungement in Judge Glass' Orders docketed on 8-27-24 and to continue the Stay on the expungement of Judge Glass' Order entered in this case on June 12, 2024 until this case is resolved in its entirety because: a.) Judge Glass is the judge who initially presided over the Defendant's Expungement hearing June 9, 2024, is the judge who ordered 30-day Stay on the granting of the Defendant's Expungement because Judge Glass informed the Defendant that her criminal case would no longer exist without the Stay on the Expungement. b.) Judge Glass is the presiding judge whose 8-27-24 Order the Defendant responded to in her 9-4-24 Motions, in which one of her Motions pleads for the Judge-in-Charge Over Criminal Case to assign Judge M. Glass, to preside over the Defendant's Motion to Stay the execution of expungement in Judge Glass' Orders docketed on 8-27-24 and to continue the Stay on the expungement of Judge Glass' Order entered in this case on June 12, 2024 until this case is resolved in its entirety.".... 13.) As evidenced by the Orders docketed 12-5-24 (Exhibits 191 and 191', respectively, on my website), Judge Cahill did not preside over my Motions mailed on 11-18-24, but the presiding judge was Judge Robinson.

CC: Hon. President Trump, the Hon. Military Tribunal, Newly Appointed Attorney General of the DOJ, Newly Appointed Director of the FBI, Public